

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 and 32-35 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 5, 6, 9-11, 14-16, 18, 19, 22-24, 26-28, 31-33, and 35 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-7 of the Reply. Claims 4 and 31 have been canceled.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Objection to Claim 4**

This objection is moot and should be withdrawn in view of the cancellation of this claims.

**II. Objection to Claim 14**

Claim 14 is objected to for minor informalities. Withdrawal of this objection is requested in view of the herein amendments to this claims.

**III. Objection of Claims 5, 9-11, 15, 18, 19, 22-24, 26 and 27**

Claims 5, 9-11, 15, 18, 19, 22-24, 26 and 27 stand objected to based on the same rational as claims 4 and 14 above. The claims have been amended and the objections thereto obviated.

Applicants' representative respectfully requests withdrawal of this objection.

**IV. Rejection of Claims 1, 4-12, 16-22, 24, 27, 32-34 Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 1, 4-12, 16-22, 24, 27, 32-34 stand rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although applicants' representative strongly disagrees with this rejection, the subject independent claims have been amended herein to emphasize that the invention is embodied in a tangible medium. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

**V. Rejection of Claims 1, 33 and 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 1, 33 and 35 stand rejected stand rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although applicants' representative strongly disagrees with this rejection, the subject independent claims have been amended herein to emphasize that the invention is embodied in a tangible medium. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

**VI. Rejection of Claim 31 Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claim 31 has been cancelled herein – withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

**VII. Rejection of Claims 1-20 and 24-35 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1-20 and 24-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Graham et al. (6,582,475) (hereinafter Graham). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-20, 24-35 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Graham.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that “*each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (quoting *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) (emphasis added).

Applicants’ claimed invention relates to systems and methods for conveying user information between and among users and allows user profile building to occur coincident with, for example, user browsing of electronic data sources (*e.g.*, web pages, among others). In particular, amended claims 1, 16, 28, 31, 32, 33 and 35 (and similarly their dependant claims 2-15, 17-20, 29-30 and 34) recite *semantic-centric input components that reflect context of the current computer-based interaction*. Where a component reflects the context of the current computer-based interaction, the component can, for example, provide options for user inputs representative of some aspect of the interaction without requiring the user to manually enter information reflective of the computer-based interaction. Graham does not disclose or suggest these novel aspects of the invention as claimed.

Graham relates to an automatic printing assistant that can select portions of documents of particular interest to the user for printing but requires the user to enter concepts and subconcepts to facilitate the selection of the portions of interest. (*See, e.g.*, Graham paragraph [0059].) Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, the cited reference does not disclose or suggest determining user input options that reflect the current computer based interaction.

For example, when visiting an electric car website, the subject invention may provide a user input button that states “I own an electric car” (reflecting the content of the webpage) that

when selected would annotate the user's profile to add "owns an electric car." As the user then navigates to a webpage for a book on environmentally friendly practices, the user input button can state "I have read this book" (reflecting the content of the webpage) that when selected would accordingly update the user profile. In contrast, the Graham invention, when visiting the first car page would require the user to manually enter a concept such as "electric cars" and manually add that concept to the user's profile. Further, when the user navigates to the book page, the user would then need to manually enter the subconcept "book I've read" and manually add that subconcept to the user's profile. Thus, Graham, neither explicitly nor inherently, recites any *semantic-centric input components that reflect context of the current computer-based interaction*.

Independent claims 1, 16, 28, 31, 32, 33, and 35 are patentable over the cited reference as the Examiner has failed to establish that each and every element of the claimed subject matter has been expressly or inherently described in Graham.

***Claim 1 and dependant claims:***

With regard to amended claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Graham discloses "the input component comprising a plurality of semantic-centric input components that reflect context of the current computer-based interaction..." Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reasons. In Graham, the user must manually input a subcomponent by selecting the add subconcept button 828 (see Graham, Fig. 8) and then typing in the subconcept in the spawned dialog box (not illustrated in Graham, but see Graham paragraph [0059] "...user adds to the list by selecting a[n]...add button 828 which causes display of a dialog box...for entering the new keyword... Once the user has finished defining the new subconcept, he or she confirms...by selecting an OK button 832...").

Graham does not expressly or inherently describe, "...semantic-centric input components that reflect context of the current computer based interaction...", as illustrated in the subject application. Graham is fundamentally different in that Graham does not reflect the context of the current computer based interaction but rather requires the user to select appropriate terms to add as subconcepts. In contrast, the subject application illustrates that the content of, for example, the web page that a user is viewing will be reflected in the semantic-centric input components (e.g., buttons) that the user can then select to update the user profile. For example, if the web

page shows a vacation resort the semantic-centric button can read “I have been there”, if the web page is a book review the semantic-centric button can read “I have read this book”, or if the web page is a product page for a specific brand the semantic-centric button can read “I love this brand”, among others (see application, pg. 7, lines 16-18, among others.) Thus, the subject innovation is sensitive to the context of the computer based interaction (the semantic-centric input components **reflect** the context) and does not require the user to either select an add button and/or to add a subconcept manually as in Graham.

Additionally, for the same reasons, Applicants submit that claims 2, 3, and 5-15 are allowable, as these claims depend from claim 1. Claim 4 has been canceled and hence the rejection is obviated.

Therefore, based on the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-15 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Graham.

***Claim 16 and dependant claims:***

With regard to amended claim 16, the Examiner asserts the same rejection as applied to claim 1 except that it relates to a method rather than a system. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the same reasons as asserted in claim 1. Additionally, for the same reasons, Applicants submit that claims 17-27 are allowable, as these claims depend from claim 16.

Therefore, based on the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 16-20 and 24-27 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Graham.

***Claim 28 and dependant claims:***

With regard to amended claim 28, the Examiner asserts the same rejection as applied to claim 1 except that it relates to a method rather than a system. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the same reasons as asserted in claim 1. Additionally, for the same reasons, Applicants submit that claims 29 and 30 are allowable, as these claims depend from claim 28.

Therefore, based on the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 28-30 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Graham.

***Claim 31, 32, 33, and 35 and dependant claims:***

With regard to amended claim 31, the Examiner asserts the same rejection as applied to claim 28. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the same reasons as asserted in claim 28.

With regard to amended claim 32, the Examiner asserts the same rejection as applied to claim 1 except that it relates to a computer-readable medium rather than a system. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the same reasons as asserted in claim 1.

With regard to amended claim 33, the Examiner asserts the same rejection as applied to claim 1 except that it relates to a computer-readable medium rather than a system. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the same reasons as asserted in claim 1. Additionally, for the same reasons, Applicants submit that claim 34 is allowable, as this claim depends from claim 33.

With regard to amended claim 35, the Examiner asserts the same rejection as applied to claim 1 except that it relates to a computer-readable medium rather than a system. Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the same reasons as asserted in claim 1.

Therefore, based on the above remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 31-35 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Graham.

**VIII. Rejection of Claims 21-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham et al. (6,582,475), in view of Wolpe (2002/0174144) (hereinafter Wolpe). Applicants respectfully disagree for at least the following reason. Independent claim 16, from which claims 21-23 depend, has been amended and is believed to be allowable over Graham as asserted *supra*. Wolpe does not correct this deficiency. The rejection of dependant claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is obviated and the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 21-23 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Graham in view of Wolpe.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP477US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731